

REMARKS

Reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims, in view of the following remarks, are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action dated March 21, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as allegedly being unpatentable over Nishida '746 (U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0017746) in view of Mallory '387 (U.S. Patent No. 5,311,387).

By this Amendment, claims 1, 2 and 6, 7 have been canceled with no prejudice. Claims 3-5 and 8-10 are amended to provide clearer presentation of the claimed subject matter, Applicant submits that no new matter has been introduced. Support for the amendments to the claims 3-5 and 8-10 may be found throughout the as-filed application (see, Specification: page 20, line 9 to page 24, line 2, and FIGs. 13-17). As such, claims 3-5 and 8-10 are currently presented for examination, of which claims 3, and 8 are independent claims.

I. Prior Art Rejections under §103(a)

As indicated above, amended claims 3 and 8, now positively recites, *inter alia*, ***a write shield arranged apart from the main pole on a trailing side to the main pole and having a multilayered structure in which a nonmagnetic layer is sandwiched between magnetic layers, the write shield having such a shape that has a thickness that is larger in each of edge portions than in a central portion along a track width direction.***

Such features are amply supported by the disclosed embodiments in the Specification. By the way of example, the disclosed embodiment provide that the write shield having the claimed configuration makes it possible to reduce the magnetic domains in both edge portions along the track width direction. The configuration suppresses the leaking field during the recording operation.

In the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledged that the primary reference, Nishida '746, does not disclose a write shield. The Examiner, however, relied on Mallary '387 as allegedly teaching these features.

In particular, the Examiner alleged that FIG. 3 of Mallary '387 depicts a write shield with pole pieces P/A and P/B attached to increase the thickness of on the opposite edges of the write shield. Mallary '387 does not disclose pole pieces P/A and P/B anywhere in the specification, but it is obvious to the practitioners of the art of magnetic circuitry, that only sensible function of the pole pieces P/A and P/B could be to reduce the magnetic reluctance of the read magnetic circuitry, and maximize the magnetic flux through the magneto-resistive detector ("MR ELEMENT" in FIG. 3). Consequently, the pole pieces P/A and P/B are positioned along the normal of the disc surface as correctly depicted in FIG. 3 (perpendicular to the line 2-2 in FIG. 1 in the direction of the normal to the magnetic disc surface). In so doing, the pole pieces of Mallary '387 can not contribute to the write shield thickness along a track width direction as clearly required by the independent claims 3 and 8. Therefore, Mallary '387 is incapable of curing the deficiencies of Nishida '746 - much less teach or suggest all the elements of claims 3 and 8 in its own right.

Furthermore, artisans of ordinary skill will readily appreciate that any attempt to reposition the pole pieces to be aligned in a track width direction would clearly defeat the intended purpose of the pole pieces by increased reluctance of large diamagnetic gaps open in the magnetic circuit of the magneto-resistive detector. Consequently, FIG. 3 of Mallary '387 can not be taken as a motivation to modify any prior art device in the direction of claimed inventions.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that the asserted references do not teach each and every element of claims 3 and 8. Furthermore, the asserted references do not provide any motivation to modify prior art devices in the direction of inventions claimed in claims 3 and 8. Accordingly, claims 3 and 8 are clearly patentable and the immediate allowance of these claims is respectfully requested. In addition, because claims 4 and 5 directly depend from claim 3 and claims 9 and 10 directly depend from claim 8, the dependant claims 4-5 and 9-10 are patentable at least by virtue of dependency as well as for their additional recitations. The

immediate allowance of the dependant claims 4-25 and claims 9-10 is also respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion.

All matters having been addressed and in view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the immediate allowance of all pending claims.

Applicant's representative remains ready to assist the Examiner in any way to facilitate and expedite the prosecution of this matter. If any point remains in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number 033975. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**PILLSBURY WINTHROP
SHAW PITTMAN LLP**

electronic signature:/E. R. Hernandez/

By: _____
E. R. HERNANDEZ
Reg. No. 47641
Tel. No. 703.770.7788
Fax No. 703.770.7901

Date: June 21, 2007
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 770-7900